



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/813,561

03/30/2004

Markus Aholainen

NOKM.094PA

4117

76385

7590

07/07/2009

Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC  
8009 34th Avenue South  
Suite 125  
Minneapolis, MN 54425

EXAMINER

YUEN, KAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2416

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/07/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/813,561	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AHOLAINEN, MARKUS	
	<b>Examiner</b> KAN YUEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2416	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-14,17-22 and 24-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-14,17-22,24-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Detailed Action***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after Final Rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/30/2009 has been entered.

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-14, 17-22, 24-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2416

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 14, 17-20, 22, 25-29, 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arwald et al. (Pat No.: 7212543) in view of Isomura et al. (Pub No.: 2002/0052966).

**For claim 1**, Arwald et al. disclosed the method for providing comprehensive service translation, comprising:

determining the protocol of a service discovery request received from a client via a home proximity network (Arwald et al. column 10, lines 1-65, column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15, fig. 1). Fig. 1 comprises a central controller system 35 (home proximity network), wherein the system further comprises a protocol coordinator 45. The protocol coordinator 45 upon receiving a particular request for establishing a communication link between one object and another, may rapidly analyze the candidate protocols and determine the most effective protocol to which to direct the different adapters used by the objects for making the communication link;

translating the protocol of the service discovery request into a service discovery protocol used by a service registry by way of a generic service discovery format, the translated service discovery request being used to discover an Internet service provider of the service requested (Arwald et al. column 10, lines 1-65, column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15). The protocol coordinator 45 will identify (discover) the protocols

Art Unit: 2416

that are within the vocabulary (mutual agreeable protocol or generic format) of the different objects under consideration, so that the resulting protocols employed during the communication session, places the minimum translation burden on the router 39.

One example of an object can be a service registry;

wherein the service registry is an internet-located service registry (fig. 2 protocol coordination mechanism 45 and the database 37, see column 8, lines 9-15, column 10, lines 1-10). The database 37 and the protocol coordination mechanism 45 can be broadly interpreted as the internet-located service registry. Since the present invention is directed to devices for enabling communication between different communication networks including for example, internet network (see column 1, lines 25-35), therefore the network is internet based;

detecting incompatibilities between the client and the service provider and translating the service provided to the client by the service provider in response to the detected incompatibilities (Arwald et al. column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15). The calling object sends a query to the central controller 35 via a predetermined protocol, after which the central controller 35 consults with the database 37 and determines which services are needed. The central controller 35 then determines which objects are to be activated, and consults with the object to be activated so as to assure a link can be established at that particular time. When the connection is established, the central controller 35 informs the adapters associated with the calling object and the called object to communicate using a certain predetermined protocol, and only if necessary, is the router 39 interjected for performing an active translation role between

Art Unit: 2416

the protocol employed by the calling object and the protocol employed by the called object.

However, Arwald et al. does not explicitly disclose the feature for discovering a service using the first and second service discovery protocols, wherein the protocols are ad hoc service discovery protocols and converts service information. Isomura et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor disclosed the feature for discovering a service using the first and second service discovery protocols, wherein the protocols are ad hoc service discovery protocols and converts service information (Isomura et al. fig. 1-4, see paragraphs 0020-0022, 0033-0034). As shown in fig. 1, service provider 10 and three appliances using different Service Discover Protocols (SDP) A, B and C. Each SDP handlers 12-14 includes a communication unit 123 or 133 for communicating through a cable such as Ethernet or through a radio such as Bluetooth, and a format conversion unit 120, 130 and 140 for converting a SDP format of the service information into the common format for the common format into the SDP format (see paragraphs 0020-0022). Fig. 4, illustrates an example, wherein Bluetooth and JINI SDPs are being used. Although the reference does not explicitly disclose ad-hoc SDP, however it is well known in the art at the time of the invention to use the ad-hoc SDP with other types of SDPs such as radio (Bluetooth) or cable (Ethernet) SDPs. Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the feature as taught by Isomura et al. in the network of Arwald et al. The motivation for using the feature being that it provides compatibility in the system.

**Regarding claim 2**, Arwald et al. disclosed the feature wherein translating the protocol includes selecting one of a plurality of service discovery interfaces that are compatible with the service registry (Arwald et al. column 10, lines 1-65, column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15, fig. 2). When an appropriate object/interface is selected, the router 39 will initiate the transmission.

**Claims 14, 17, 19** are rejected similar to claim 1.

**Regarding claim 18**, Arwald et al. disclosed the means for receiving the service provided using a first transport protocol and means for providing the service provided using a second transport protocol (Arwald et al. see column 8, lines 1-29, column 10, lines 1-35).

**Regarding claim 20**, Arwald et al. disclosed the feature wherein locating a service provider comprises issuing the translated service request to a service registry (Arwald et al. fig. 2 protocol coordination mechanism 45 and the database 37, see column 8, lines 9-15, column 10, lines 1-10). The database 37 and the protocol coordination mechanism 45 can be broadly interpreted as the internet-located service registry. Since the present invention is directed to devices for enabling communication between different communication networks including for example, internet network (see column 1, lines 25-35), therefore the network is internet based. The database 37 will include an indication as to whether or not a common protocol exists between the calling object 21, and the called object, say service F31. The protocol coordination mechanism 45 keeps track of the different protocols employed by the different objects 21-33 and

includes a mechanism for comparing the communication attributes between the different protocols.

**Regarding claim 22**, Arwald et al. disclosed the system comprising:

a plurality of home devices (fig. 2, objects 21-33) configured to exchange media content in a first format via a home proximity network (fig. 2, controller system 35) using a first service discovery protocol; at least one mobile device configured to exchange media content in a second format via the home proximity network using a second service discovery protocol (Arwald et al. column 10, lines 1-65, column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15, fig. 1). Fig. 1 comprises a central controller system 35 (home proximity network), wherein the system further comprises a protocol coordinator 45. The protocol coordinator 45 upon receiving a particular request for establishing a communication link for communication session between one object and another, may rapidly analyze the candidate protocols and determine the most effective protocol to which to direct the different adapters used by the objects for making the communication link;

a service translation proxy (fig. 2, protocol coordination mechanism 45) coupled to the plurality of home devices and the at least one mobile device, wherein the service translation proxy is configured to:

translate service discovery requests between the first and second service discovery protocols via a generic service discovery format (Arwald et al. column 10, lines 1-65, column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15). The protocol coordinator 45 will identify (discover) the protocols that are within the vocabulary (mutual agreeable



Art Unit: 2416

protocol or generic format) of the different objects under consideration, so that the resulting protocols employed during the communication session, places the minimum translation burden on the router 39. One example of an object can be a service registry;

establish services between the plurality of home devices and the mobile device via the home proximity network based on the translated service discovery request (Arwald et al. column 10, lines 1-65, column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15).

Once the mutual agreeable protocol is determined, a requested communication session can be established between two objects; and

translate the media exchanged between the plurality of home devices and the at least one mobile device in response to their respective capabilities determined via the respective first and second service discovery protocols (Arwald et al. column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15). The calling object sends a query to the central controller 35 via a predetermined protocol, after which the central controller 35 consults with the database 37 and determines which services are needed. The central controller 35 then determines which objects are to be activated, and consults with the object to be activated so as to assure a link can be established at that particular time. When the connection is established, the central controller 35 informs the adapters associated with the calling object and the called object to communicate using a certain predetermined protocol, and only if necessary, is the router 39 interjected for performing an active translation role between the protocol employed by the calling object and the protocol employed by the called object.

However, Arwald et al. does not explicitly disclose the feature for discovering a service using the first and second service discovery protocols, wherein the protocols are ad hoc service discovery protocols and converts service information.

Isomura et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor disclosed the feature for discovering a service using the first and second service discovery protocols, wherein the protocols are ad hoc service discovery protocols and converts service information (Isomura et al. fig. 1-4, see paragraphs 0020-0022, 0033-0034). As shown in fig. 1, service provider 10 and three appliances using different Service Discover Protocols (SDP) A, B and C. Each SDP handlers 12-14 includes a communication unit 123 or 133 for communicating through a cable such as Ethernet or through a radio such as Bluetooth, and a format conversion unit 120, 130 and 140 for converting a SDP format of the service information into the common format for the common format into the SDP format (see paragraphs 0020-0022). Fig. 4, illustrates an example, wherein Bluetooth and JINI SDPs are being used. Although the reference does not explicitly disclose ad-hoc SDP, however it is well known in the art at the time of the invention to use the ad-hoc SDP with other types of SDPs such as radio (Bluetooth) or cable (Ethernet) SDPs. Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the feature as taught by Isomura et al. in the network of Arwald et al. The motivation for using the feature being that it provides compatibility in the system.

**Regarding claim 25**, Arwald et al. disclosed the method comprising:

establishing a mobile device (fig. 2, networks 21-29) and a home device (fig. 2, networks 21-33) as entities of a wireless home proximity network (fig. 2, central

Art Unit: 2416

controller system 35), wherein the mobile device communicates via a first service discovery protocol and the second device communicates via a second service discovery protocol (Arwald et al. column 12, lines 11-60). The different objects then receive information from the central controller 35, regarding how the adapters associated with each of the objects, should convert the native protocol (first service discovery protocol) into a mutually agreeable protocol (second service discovery protocol). Regarding the different connections between the adapters 21a-21f, any one of a variety of connections may be included, such as wireless or wired connection (see column 8, lines 29-45);

translating a service discovery request of the first ad hoc service discovery\_ protocol into a translated request the second service discovery protocol by way of a generic service discovery format (Arwald et al. column 10, lines 1-65, column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15). The protocol coordinator 45 will identify (discover) the protocols that are within the vocabulary (mutual agreeable protocol or generic format) of the different objects under consideration, so that the resulting protocols employed during the communication session, places the minimum translation burden on the router 39. One example of an object can be a service registry;

establishing the service between the mobile device and the home device via the home proximity network based on the translated service discovery request (Arwald et al. column 10, lines 1-65, column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15). Once the mutual agreeable protocol is determined, a requested communication session can be established between two objects;

Art Unit: 2416

evaluating differences in media capabilities between the mobile device and the home device via the respective first and second service discovery protocols (Arwald et al. column 10, lines 1-35). The protocol coordination mechanism 45, upon receiving a particular request for establishing a link between one object and another, it may rapidly analyze the candidate protocols and determine the most effective protocol to which to direct the different adapters used by the objects for making the communication link; and

translating media exchanged between the mobile device and the home device in response to the media capability differences between the mobile device and the home device (Arwald et al. column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15). The calling object sends a query to the central controller 35 via a predetermined protocol, after which the central controller 35 consults with the database 37 and determines which services are needed. The central controller 35 then determines which objects are to be activated, and consults with the object to be activated so as to assure a link can be established at that particular time. When the connection is established, the central controller 35 informs the adapters associated with the calling object and the called object to communicate using a certain predetermined protocol, and only if necessary, is the router 39 interjected for performing an active translation role between the protocol employed by the calling object and the protocol employed by the called object.

However, Arwald et al. does not explicitly disclose the feature for discovering a service using the first and second service discovery protocols, wherein the protocols are ad hoc service discovery protocols and converts service information.

Isomura et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor disclosed the feature for discovering a service using the first and second service discovery protocols, wherein the protocols are ad hoc service discovery protocols and converts service information (Isomura et al. fig. 1-4, see paragraphs 0020-0022, 0033-0034). As shown in fig. 1, service provider 10 and three appliances using different Service Discover Protocols (SDP) A, B and C. Each SDP handlers 12-14 includes a communication unit 123 or 133 for communicating through a cable such as Ethernet or through a radio such as Bluetooth, and a format conversion unit 120, 130 and 140 for converting a SDP format of the service information into the common format for the common format into the SDP format (see paragraphs 0020-0022). Fig. 4, illustrates an example, wherein Bluetooth and JINI SDPs are being used. Although the reference does not explicitly disclose ad-hoc SDP, however it is well known in the art at the time of the invention to use the ad-hoc SDP with other types of SDPs such as radio (Bluetooth) or cable (Ethernet) SDPs. Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the feature as taught by Isomura et al. in the network of Arwald et al. The motivation for using the feature being that it provides compatibility in the system.

**Regarding claim 26,** Arwald et al. disclosed automatically determining the media format capability of the mobile device using a service translation proxy and automatically determining the media format capability of the home device using the service translation proxy (Arwald et al. column 10, lines 1-35). The protocol coordination mechanism 45 keeps track of the different protocols employed by the different objects 21, 33. Upon receiving a particular request for establishing a link between one object and

Art Unit: 2416

another, it may rapidly or automatically analyze the candidate protocols and determine the most effective protocol to which to direct the different adapters used by the objects for making the communication link.

**Regarding claim 27**, Arwald et al. disclosed the feature wherein translating the media comprises: translating the media format received from the home device into media format that is compatible with the media format capability of the mobile device and translating the media format received from the mobile device into media format that is compatible with the media format capability of the home device (Arwald et al. see column 8, lines 1-29, column 10, lines 1-35).

**Regarding claim 28**, Arwald et al. disclosed the apparatus comprising:

a network interface (Arwald et al. fig. 2, protocol coordination mechanism 45) capable of communicating with a service requestor (fig. 2, objects 21) via a home proximity network (fig. 2, central controller system 35) using a first service discovery protocol and at least one internet service provider (fig. 2, network 21-29) a second service discovery protocol (Arwald et al. column 12, lines 11-60). The different objects then receive information from the central controller 35, regarding how the adapters associated with each of the objects, should convert the native protocol (first service discovery protocol) into a mutually agreeable protocol (second service discovery protocol). Regarding the different connections between the adapters 21a-21f, any one of a variety of connections may be included, such as wireless or wired connection (see column 8, lines 29-45);

wherein at least one of the first and second service discovery protocols utilize an Internet-located service registry (fig. 2 protocol coordination mechanism 45 and the database 37, see column 8, lines 9-15, column 10, lines 1-10). The database 37 and the protocol coordination mechanism 45 can be broadly interpreted as the internet-located service registry. Since the present invention is directed to devices for enabling communication between different communication networks including for example, internet network (see column 1, lines 25-35), therefore the network is internet based. The database 37 will include an indication as to whether or not a common protocol exists between the calling object 21, and the called object, say service F31. The protocol coordination mechanism 45 keeps track of the different protocols employed by the different objects 21-33 and includes a mechanism for comparing the communication attributes between the different protocols;

a processor (fig. 2, router 39) coupled to the network interface; and configured with instructions that cause the apparatus to perform the functionalities, which are rejected similar to claim 22.

**Regarding claim 29**, Arwald et al. disclosed the feature wherein locating the service provider comprises issuing the translated service request to the Internet-located service registry (Arwald et al. column 12, lines 11-67, column 13, lines 1-15). The calling object sends a query to the central controller 35 via a predetermined protocol, after which the central controller 35 consults with the database 37 and determines which services are needed.

**Regarding claim 31**, Arwald et al. disclosed the feature wherein translating the service provided comprises: receiving messages from the service provider using a first transport protocol; and transmitting the messages received from the service provider to the service requestor using a second transport protocol (Arwald et al. see column 8, lines 1-29, column 10, lines 1-35).

**Regarding claims 32-34**, Isomura et al. disclosed the feature for translating the ad hoc service discovery request via a canonical query transform service operating on the home proximity network that interacts with clients to allow generic service discovery queries to be translated and subsequently issued via specific service discovery protocols (Isomura et al. see paragraph 0031). The inquiry message may include name of service information requested. The format conversion unit will convert the name of service information into the common format and retrieve or search the common database. Then or subsequently, the format conversion unit will convert the searched result from the database into a format in a SDP used in the inquired appliance, and the server will send the converted searched result to the inquired appliance. The canonical query transform in the claim does not further specify/distinguish the uniqueness in terms of functionality, therefore based on the broadest reasonable interpretation, the functionalities (conversion and searching) of the format conversion unit is the canonical query transform.



Art Unit: 2416

5. Claims 4-8 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arwald et al. (Pat No.: 7212543) in view of Isomura et al. (Pub No.: 2002/0052966) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of McConnell et al. (Pat No.: 6741695).

**For claims 4 and 30**, Arwald et al. and Isomura et al. both does not explicitly disclose the feature wherein detecting the incompatibilities comprises analyzing session descriptions contained within Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) messages exchanged between the client and the service provider.

McConnell et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor disclosed the feature wherein detecting the incompatibilities comprises analyzing session descriptions contained within Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) messages exchanged between the client and the service provider (McConnell et al. see column 6, lines 45-67, column 7, lines 30-50). The SIP server 34 may use a different set of parameters, or parameters in a different format, to provide services to subscriber devices connected to packet-switched network 16. As a result, part of the process of SIP server 34 obtaining service profile information for subscriber device 30 may include parsing the service profile, extracting the service parameters therefrom, and translating or reformatting the extracted service parameters into a form used by SIP server 34. Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the feature as taught by McConnell et al. in the network of Arwald et al. and Isomura et al. The motivation for using the feature being that it would be advantageous to make similar enhanced services available to the subscriber when operating on packet or circuit switched networks, thus it greatly improves compatibility.

**Regarding claim 5**, Arwald et al. disclosed the feature wherein the session descriptions transmitted by the client reflects the capabilities of the client (Arwald et al. column 7, lines 40-65, column 8, lines 1-45).

**Regarding claim 6**, Arwald et al. disclosed the feature wherein the capabilities of the client include media session capabilities (Arwald et al. column 3, lines 40-65).

**Regarding claim 7**, Arwald et al. disclosed the feature wherein the session descriptions transmitted by the service provider reflects the capabilities of the service provider (Arwald et al. column 7, lines 40-65, column 8, lines 1-45).

**Regarding claim 8**, Arwald et al. disclosed the feature wherein the capabilities of the service provider include media session capabilities (Arwald et al. column 3, lines 40-65).

6. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arwald et al. (Pat No.: 7212543) in view of Isomura et al. (Pub No.: 2002/0052966) and McConnell et al. (Pat No.: 6741695) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Monroe (Pat No.: 6130917).

**For claim 9**, Arwald et al., Isomura et al. and McConnell et al. all did not explicitly disclose the feature wherein translating the service provided comprises translating media received from the service provider into a format compatible with the media session capabilities of the client. Monroe from the same or similar fields of endeavor disclosed the feature wherein translating the service provided comprises translating

Art Unit: 2416

media received from the service provider into a format compatible with the media session capabilities of the client (Monroe see column 4, lines 27-40). The reference originates an audio signal from the source, and since the system can initiate conversion at the source or destination, so therefore in this case, the system converts the destination data format to comply with the audio signal generated from the source. Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the feature as taught by Monroe in the network of Arwald et al., Isomura et al. and McConnell et al. The motivation for using the feature being that it increases transmission efficiency.

**Regarding claim 10**, McConnell et al. disclosed the feature wherein translating the service provided comprises: modifying the session descriptions received from the client to match the session descriptions received from the service provider; and transmitting the modified session descriptions to the service provider (McConnell et al. see column 6, lines 45-67, column 7, lines 30-50). The SIP server 34 may use a different set of parameters, or parameters in a different format, to provide services to subscriber devices connected to packet-switched network 16. As a result, part of the process of SIP server 34 obtaining service profile information for subscriber device 30 may include parsing the service profile, extracting the service parameters therefrom, and translating or reformatting the extracted service parameters into a form used by SIP server 34.

**Regarding claim 11**, Monroe disclosed the feature wherein translating the service provided further comprises: modifying the session descriptions received from

Art Unit: 2416

the service provider to match the session descriptions received from the client; and transmitting the modified session descriptions to the client (Monroe see column 2, lines 27-50, see column 4, lines 45-55). In the reference, the system selects the proper conversion technique based on the detection of incompatibilities, which can be interpreted as analyzing session description. As shown in the reference, the system can initiate conversion at the source or destination

**Regarding claim 12**, Monroe disclosed the feature wherein translating the service provided comprises: receiving messages from the service provider using a first transport protocol; and transmitting the messages received from the service provider to the client using a second transport protocol (Monroe see column 2, lines 27-50). As shown, the source originates a data format, which is the first protocol, and then conversion takes place at the source to change the data format at the source to comply with the destination data format, which is the second protocol.

**Regarding claim 13**, Monroe disclosed the feature wherein translating the service provided comprises: receiving messages from the client using the second transport protocol; and transmitting the messages received from the client to the service provider using the first transport protocol (Monroe see column 2, lines 27-50). As shown, the source originates a data format, which is the first protocol, and then conversion takes place at the destination to change the data format at the destination to comply with the source data format, which is the second protocol.

Art Unit: 2416

1. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arwald et al. (Pat No.: 7212543) in view of Isomura et al. (Pub No.: 2002/0052966) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Keenan et al. (Pub No.: 2004/0208164).

**For claim 21**, Arwald et al., and Isomura et al. both did not disclosed the feature wherein locating a service provider comprises forwarding the service request to another service translation proxy located within the network. Keenan et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor teaches the feature of locating a service provider comprises forwarding the service request to another service translation proxy located within the network (Keenan et al. paragraph 0060). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the feature as taught by Keenan et al. in the network of Arwald et al., and Isomura et al. The motivation for using the feature as taught by Keenan et al. in the network of Arwald et al. and Isomura et al. being that it provides accuracy in the transmission system.

2. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arwald et al. (Pat No.: 7212543) in view of Isomura et al. (Pub No.: 2002/0052966) as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Loveland (Pub No.: (2006/0178137)).

**For claim 24**, Arwald et al. and Isomura et al. both did not explicitly disclose the feature wherein the proximity connection includes a Bluetooth connection. Loveland from the same or similar fields of endeavor disclosed the feature wherein the proximity connection includes a Bluetooth connection (Loveland paragraph 0022-0024, fig. 1, cell

Art Unit: 2416

phone 140). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the feature as taught by Loveland in the network of Arwald et al. and Isomura et al. The motivation for using the feature being that it provides scalability in the network.

***Examiner's Note:***

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAN YUEN whose telephone number is (571)270-1413. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10:00a.m-3:00p.m EST.

Art Unit: 2416

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky O. Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kan Yuen/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2416

/Ricky Ngo/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2416

KY